UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/521,823 | 11/07/2005 | Robert K. Yang | 1199-13 PCT/US | 2398 |
| Daniel A Scola | 7590 06/23/200 | EXAMINER | | |
| Hoffmann & Ba | aron | SHEIKH, HUMERA N | | |
| 6900 Jericho Turnpike Syosset, NY 11791 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1615 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/23/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/521,823 | YANG ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Humera N. Sheikh | 1615 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address | | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE on time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)[\] | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Is | anuary 2005 | | | | | |
| · | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 January 2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| ′= | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| ٥/ك | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| · · _ | Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application | | | | | | |
| • | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| • | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| - | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | alastian requirement | | | | | |
| 0) | Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> are subject to restriction and/or e | election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc | epted or b) ☐ objected to by the | Examiner. | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) 🔲 | 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notic 3) Inforr | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | ate | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

Claims 1-28 are pending in this action. Claims 1-28 are subject to a Restriction/Election requirement.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-20, drawn to an oral dosage delivery vehicle (class 424/401,439).

Group II, claim(s) 21-26, drawn to a package (class 206/438, 449, 484).

Group III, claim(s) 27 and 28, drawn to a process of making and process of using (nominal) (class 264/172.19; 156/308.4)

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature that is lacking is an edible film with a surface area comprising voids that are used to increase surface area.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

(a) dosage without active ingredient (see claim 11)

(b) dosage with active ingredient (see claims 16-17)

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species (a) corresponds to claim 11; Species (b) corresponds to claims 16/17.

The following claim(s) are generic: Claim 11.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The inclusion of an active ingredient alters the chemical, pharmaceutical and physiological properties of the film and would provide for unique effects and results compared to that of a film without inclusion of the active ingredient.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Art Unit: 1615

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim

will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Because the above restriction/election is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP 812.01.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Humera N. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-0604. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday during regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,823 Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Humera N. Sheikh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615

hns

June 22, 2009